UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/898,368	07/03/2001	Richard C. Notargiacomo	82503F-P	1084

7590   05/18/2004

Milton S. Sales
Patent Legal Staff
Eastman Kodak Company
343 State Street
Rochester, NY   14650-2201

EXAMINER
LU, KUEN S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2177	5

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	09/898,368	NOTARGIACOMO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kuen S Lu	2177	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _18 March 2004_.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-26,33_ is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
     a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
        1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendments

1. In responding to Applicants' amendments made to the claims, filed on March 18, 2004, the Examiner has created this Office Action for Final Rejection as shown next.

2. As for the Applicants' REMARKS, filed on March 18, 2004, has been fully considered by the Examiner, please see discussion in the section *Response to Arguments*, following the Office Action for Final Rejection as shown next.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 20 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In this case, "multiple unrelated databases" was not supported in the Specifications, specifically the term **unrelated** was not described. In the interest of compact prosecution of the Application, the Examiner interprets 'unrelated databases' as <u>a plurality of databases whose relationship are not specifically defined, however, the databases all may contain some data related to or belong to a common subject matter.</u>

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 20 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In this case, "multiple unrelated databases" was not supported in the Specifications, specifically the term **unrelated** was not described. In the interest of compact prosecution of the Application, the Examiner interprets 'unrelated databases' as <u>a plurality of databases whose relationship are not specifically defined, however, the databases all may contain some data related to or belong to a common subject matter</u>.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 10-20, 26 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Huff (U.S. Pub. 2002/0032687).

As per claims 1 and 33, Huff teaches the following:

"gathering information relevant to the creation of a family tree, organizing the information, and displaying it in the form of a family tree" at Abstract, lines 8-11 by showing the lineage-linked genealogical data storage and retrieval method and system, comprising the steps of:

"searching multiple unrelated databases through a network and scanning the database for relevant information" at Page 7, [0104] by showing searchers searching central databases (Page 5, [0077]) for data that relate to their family through the internet (Page 5, [0077] and Page 2, [0036]) where there is no relationship described among the databases;

"reviewing said information according to a set of algorithms for relationships to other individuals entered into the local database and assessing the probability that the newly identified individual is related to the original individual" at Page 2, [0036], Page 5, [0091] and Page 6, [0098] by configuring the system for internet transactions to allow users update and review the genealogical data, suggesting separate computers for sharing the functions of the central site, and showing records comprising a person-identifying number which shows his or her relationship to another person and the number of that person;

"providing said information, along with the probability assessment to the user for acceptance or rejection" at [0036], [0092] and [0126] on Pages 2, 5-6 and 7, respectively by user to evaluate, correct, review and update the database manually and at Page 8, [0130] and Page 9, [0130] by analyzing incoming data to determine the number of separate trees or linked sets of names that are contained in the data

collection and provide a way to separate out those linked segment for treatment and by

using probability judgment for verifying record and indicating level of confidence for data

and links; and

"updating the database upon acceptance by the user" at [0036], [0092] and [0126] on

Pages 2, 5-6 and 7, respectively by user to evaluate, correct, review and update the

database manually.

As per Claim 2, Huff teaches "network is the internet" at Page 2, [0036] by showing

users are connected through internet.

As per Claim 3, Huff teaches "said algorithms are contained in software that is loaded

onto a personal computer" at Fig. 1, elements 12-18 and 22-26, and Page 1, [0004] by

showing genealogical data records in personal computer undergoing various processes

and being included a much larger name collection to be sent to the central server

database.

As per Claim 5, Huff teaches "algorithms are contained in software that is contained

on a third party server and is accessed by the user via a connection to a network" at

Page 5, [0091] by showing three kinds of program functions performing on the Data

Conversion and Consolidation Workstation and the functions which can go to central

internet site, and suggesting separate computers to execute specialized operations.

As per Claim 7, Huff teaches "the data is rendered into a family tree format and

printed on a printer connected to a personal computer" at Page 8, [0123] by showing

genealogy procedures comprising paper system or relatively small accumulations of

names in linked electronic form on a home PC.

As per Claim 10, Huff teaches "data is stored on a Compact Disk" at Page 5, [0089] by collecting small genealogical files on diskette to transfer to a consolidation workstation.

As per Claim 11, Huff teaches "wherein the data is input at a third party location, such as a funeral home" at Page 5, [0090] by showing data input may come from many different sources, including direct transfer from other computers.

As per Claim 12, Huff teaches "wherein the data is partitioned into sections" at Page 6, [0100] by using two or more sections to provide space for storing the main table information.

As per Claim 13, Huff teaches "wherein different levels of accessibility are provided for each section" at Page 100, [0100] by showing access of data through publishers, submissions and registrations.

As per Claim 14, Huff teaches "wherein the individuals are related not through family relationships but due to other experiences" at Page 6, [0100] by matching users and publishers for specific genealogy research tasks.

As per Claim 15, Huff teaches "wherein said experience is a secondary school or university class" at Page 9, [0130] by gathering statistics of incoming data concerning such things as surname distribution, time and place of data, and the like.

As per Claim 16, Huff teaches "wherein said experience is related to military service" at Page 9, [0130] by gathering statistics of incoming data concerning such things as surname distribution, time and place of data, and the like.

As per Claim 17, Huff teaches "wherein said data may comprise any one of the following: text, image, or sound" at Page 7, [0109] and Page 9, [0136] by including GUI for normal text and image, and adding audio and video data types for table storage.

As per Claim 18, Huff teaches "wherein other individuals may add or edit information contained in the database" at Page 8, [0122] by allowing user to specify data, including editorial support, and at Page 9, [0133] by providing numbers to people, who prepare the names as entry to the system, as the place to enter their data.

As per Claim 19, Huff teaches "the user has the option to approve or not approve said additions or edits" at Page 9, [0131] by matching data and merging with a small data files at the workstations before the data is moved to main database in bulk.

As per claim 20, Huff teaches the following:

"gathering information relevant to the creation of a family tree, organizing the information, and displaying it in the form of a family tree" at Abstract, lines 8-11 by showing the lineage-linked genealogical data storage and retrieval method and system, comprising the steps of:

"searching multiple unrelated databases through a network and scanning the database for relevant information" at Page 7, [0104] by showing searchers searching central databases (Page 5, [0077]) for data that relate to their family through the internet (Page 5, [0077] and Page 2, [0036]) where there is no relationship described among the databases;

"reviewing said information according to a set of algorithms for relationships to other individuals entered into the local database and assessing the probability that the newly

identified individual is related to the original individual" at Page 2, [0036], Page 5, [0091] and Page 6, [0098] by configuring the system for internet transactions to allow users update and review the genealogical data, suggesting separate computers for sharing the functions of the central site, and showing records comprising a person-identifying number which shows his or her relationship to another person and the number of that person;

"providing said information, along with the probability assessment to the user for acceptance or rejection" at Page 8, [0130] and Page 9, [0130] by analyzing incoming data to determine the number of separate trees or linked sets of names that are contained in the data collection and provide a way to separate out those linked segment for treatment; and

"updating the database upon acceptance by the user wherein the data comprising the family tree is contained in a web page hosted on a server connected to a network" at [0036], [0092] and [0126] on Pages 2, 5-6 and 7, respectively by user to evaluate, correct, review and update the database manually and at Pages 5, [0089] and 7, [0113], Huff teaches small files chosen and collected from the data collections on the internet.

As per Claim 26, Huff teaches "electronic data base is accessed by personal computer at a location remote from said electronic data base" at Page 2, [0036] by showing home PC connecting to server through network.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention

was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 4, 6, 8-9, and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huff (U.S. Pub. 2002/0032687), as applied to Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 10-20, 26-30 and 32-33 above, and further in view of Perkowski (U.S. Patent 6,625,581).

As per claim 4, Huff teaches "said algorithms are contained in software that is loaded onto a personal computer" at Fig. 1, elements 12-18 and 22-26, and Page 1, [0004].

Huff does not specifically teach "wherein said algorithms are contained in software that is loaded onto Kiosk".

However, Perkowski teaches client computer in the form of web-based multi-media kiosk at col. 35, lines 45-48.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Perkowski's teaching into Huff's by further including kiosk as an additional type of client systems because by doing so the client system can be installed at virtually location in Cyberspace for the convenience of consumers residing there within without disturbing their point of presence such that Huff's system would be reachable anywhere and anytime.

As per Claim 6, Perkowski further teaches "wherein said network is the Internet" At col. 36, lines 63-65 by using internet over kiosk.

As per Claim 8, Perkowski further teaches "wherein the printing is done on a Kiosk" at col. 35, line 65-67 by printing web pages at kiosk printer.

As per Claim 9, Perkowski further teaches "wherein the printing is done by a third party service provider" at col. 35, line 65-67 by using consumer commands to print.

As per Claim 21, Huff teaches web site storing genealogy data in machine readable format at Page 7, [0107].

Huff does not specifically teach "wherein the data comprising the family tree is contained in a web page hosted on a server connected to a network".

However, Perkowski teaches using web pages served by web server and client systems on the network at col. 54, lines 22-36.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Perkowski's teaching into Huff's by using web pages to depict family tree because doing by doing so the users of Huff's system would only need one single click to execute an applet to display the family tree.

As per Claim 22, Perkowski further teaches "wherein said network is the Internet" at col. 54, lines 22-36.

As per Claim 23, Perkowski further teaches "wherein said web page includes a template for setting forth the manner and structure of the web page/site" at col. 82, lines 53-61 by formatting into a file structure.

As per Claim 24, Perkowski further teaches "wherein said web page is hosted by a business establishment having a plurality of such web pages" at col. 54, lines 22-36.

As per Claim 25, Huff teaches "network is the internet" at Page 2, [0036] by showing users are connected through internet.

Huff does not teach "wherein said electronic data base is accessed by a Kiosk".

However, Perkowski teaches accessing central database through kiosk at col. 12, lines 6-12.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Perkowski's teaching into Huff's by including kiosk as a tool to access genealogy data because by doing so the client system can be installed at virtually location in Cyberspace for the convenience of consumers residing there within without disturbing their point of presence such that Huff's system would be reachable anywhere and anytime.

As per Claim 31, Huff teaches generating a family tree at Page 14, [0205].

Huff does not teach "printing an album with image and text of said family tree".

However, Perkowski teaches printing image and text web pages at col. 35, lines 65-67.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Perkowski's teaching into Huff's by using web pages to depict family tree because doing by doing so the users of Huff's system would only need one single click to execute an applet to display the family tree and further running a hard copy.

7. The prior art made of record

A. U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0032687

B. U.S. Patent   6625581

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

C. U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0051946

D. U.S. Patent   5819263

E. U.S. Patent   6240421

F. U.S. Patent   6460028

G. U.S. Patent   5557786

H. U.S. Patent   6618727

I. U.S. Patent   5754850

J. U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0112230

Response to Arguments

8. The Applicants' arguments filed on March 18, 2004 have been fully considered, but

they are not persuasive, for the Examiner's response, please see discussion below.

a). At Page 6, Claims 1, 20 and 33, Applicants argued **"the Huff reference is directed**

to a database that is used to determine if people are related to one another. This is a

distinct aspect to the present invention where the method includes gathering information

relevant for creating a family tree and which includes searching multiple unrelated

databases. In Huff, there is a single database that is searched in order to provide the

information to the inquirer. The Examiner recites page 7, paragraph 104 for supporting

the position that this reference teaches searching multiple unrelated databases through

a network and scanning the database for relevant information".

As to the above argument a), the Examiner disagreed because of the following:

The Huff references teaches multiple databases as suggested in Page 5, [0077] where a central server database includes reference to two or more databases. As to **unrelated databases**, Huff does not specifically teach how they related to each other and the Applicants do not describe how they are **related, unrelated, inclusive or exclusive to each other**, or how they are **related, unrelated, inclusive or exclusive to a subject matter**, among other relationships in the specification. However, the Examiner interpret **the files and databases in Huff reference** and **the databases in the specification** both have **relevant information**. Huff also teaches collecting small files from internet and does not suggest any specific relationships among the files and, between databases and files.

b). At Page 6, Claims 1, 20 and 33, Applicants submitted Huff reference at Page 7, [0104] _" simply the ability for individuals to prepare genealogical data to be transferred to the internet site to be published. The users or searchers search the central site for data related to their family. This system does not go out and search unrelated databases, but allows individuals to submit data and then allow people to search the central database"._

As to the above argument b), the Examiner disagreed because small files are **collected from internet** (Page 7, [0113]) and users are able to evaluate, correct, review and update the database manually ([0036], [0092] and [0126] on Pages 2, 5-6 and 7, respectively).

c). At Page 7, Claims 1, 20 and 33, Applicants further argued _"paragraph 36 at page 2 for illustrating that searchers search through a central database for data that relate to their family through the internet. However, this does not teach or suggest the creation of a search engine for searching unrelated databases for obtaining relevant information for_

<u>creation of the database. Quite the contrary, this is merely disclosing the ability to search</u>

<u>a database over the internet".</u>

As to the above argument c), the Examiner disagreed because small files are

collected from internet (Page 7, [0113]) and users are able to evaluate, correct, review

and update the database manually ([0036], [0092] and [0126] on Pages 2, 5-6 and 7,

respectively).

d). At Page 7, Claims 1, 20 and 33, Applicants continued to argue <u>"The Examiner then</u>

<u>cites page 2, paragraph 36, page 5, paragraph 91 and page 6, paragraph 98 for the</u>

<u>proposition that there is disclosed a reviewing of the information according to a set of</u>

<u>algorithms for relationships to other individuals entered in a local database and</u>

<u>accessing the probability the new identified individual is related to the individual. As</u>

<u>previously noted, paragraph 36 merely is directed to a user accessing a database at a</u>

<u>workstation".</u>

As to the above argument d), the Examiner disagreed as previous noted that small

files are collected from internet (Page 7, [0113]) and **users are able to evaluate, correct,**

review and update the database manually ([0036], [0092] and [0126] on Pages 2, 5-6

and 7, respectively).

e). At Page 7, Claims 1, 20 and 33, Applicants continued to argue <u>"Paragraph 91 at</u>

<u>page 5, merely teaches accepting data. Accepting data is not the same thing as going out</u>

<u>to unrelated databases and searching for relevant information. Quite the contrary, there</u>

<u>is no searching at all involved. The paragraph is directed to accepting user information</u>

<u>that is simply entered into the database. With regard to paragraph 98 at page 6, this is</u>

<u>simply directed to removing duplicate names from the normal search and review</u>

process. This is done by the shadow delete records 54... with probability assessment to
the user for acceptance or rejection.

As to the above argument e), the Examiner disagreed as previous noted that small
files are collected from internet (Page 7, [0113]) which suggests some **going out and
searching mechanism** was involved before the files can be collected and **users are able
to evaluate, correct, review and update the database manually** ([0036], [0092] and [0126]
on Pages 2, 5-6 and 7, respectively). The process of evaluating, correcting, reviewing
and updating manually involves more than removing duplicate names from the normal
search and review process by the shadow delete records. Furthermore, evaluation and
review is the process of assessment of record for its possible use. As to probability
assessment, Huff teaches analyzing incoming data to determine the number of separate
trees or linked sets of names that are contained in the data collection and provide a way
to separate out those linked segment for treatment and by using probability judgment for
verifying record and indicating level of confidence for data and links at Page 8, [0130]
and Page 9, [0130].

f). At Page 7, Claims 1, 20 and 33, Applicants further submitted "Applicant respectfully
submits that paragraph 130 does not disclose such. First, it is the program that accepts
and analyzes a large number of small files. More specifically, it is the programs that do
the analysis as set forth at page 9, items 15. This is not a probability assessment, but
simply how he gathers information".

As to the above argument f), the Examiner disagreed as previous noted that at
[0036], [0092] and [0126] on Pages 2, 5-6 and 7, respectively by user to evaluate,
correct, review and update the database manually and at Page 8, [0130] and Page 9,

[0130] by analyzing incoming data to determine the number of separate trees or linked

sets of names that are contained in the data collection and provide a way to separate

out those linked segment for treatment and by using probability judgment for verifying

record and indicating level of confidence for data and links.

g). At Page 7, Claims 1, 20 and 33, Applicants further argued "**The Examiner cites page**

3, paragraph 42 that the database is updated upon acceptance of the user. What is

discussed in paragraph 42 is the data entry of a user that just compiles the information

into the central site. This does not teach or suggest building a tree based on information

gathered or accepted by the user."

As to the above argument g), the Examiner disagreed as previous noted that **users**

are able to evaluate, correct, review and update the database manually ([0036], [0092]

and [0126] on Pages 2, 5-6 and 7, respectively). The processes of evaluate, correct,

review and update all clearly indicate some follow up step is being taken about the

record processed, including data accepted after being corrected, or rejected if not

correctable.

As to dependent claims **2-19 and 21-26**, which depend on claims 1 and 20,

respectively, the Examiner applies the above stated arguments for the respective claim

upon which they depend.

9. In light of the forgoing arguments, the U.S.C 102 rejection for Claims 1-26 and 33

are hereby sustained.

Conclusions

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.**

The Applicants are reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon, if any, is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

If a reference indicated as being mailed on PTO-FORM 892 has not been enclosed in this action, please contact Lisa Craney whose telephone number is (703) 305-9601 for faster service.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuen S Lu whose telephone number is 703-305-4894. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM, Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-

3900.

Kuen S. Lu

Patent Examiner

May 17, 2004

JOHN BREENE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100